

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: May 01, 2017
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski
Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9579
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Nicaragua
PROJECT TITLE:	Resilient Landscapes Management Project
GEF AGENCIES:	World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Biodiversity

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP believes that this is an excellent project concept which, if successful, will restore important biodiversity habitats in private, community and state protected areas (PAs), while also reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The project is well conceived with a genuine match between budget/timeframe and expected achievements. It also includes a realistic identification of institutional, organizational and technical risks: it is therefore likely to deliver all that it promises, because the scale of project is realistic, as is the understanding of challenges.

The proposed project objective is consistent with the key problems described in the PIF. Strengthening the National PA system, combined with sustainable land use and restoration should lead to increased biodiversity, resilient landscapes and improved livelihoods. These measures, along with the mainstreaming of biodiversity in sector policies, address problems of the low value of subsistence agriculture, exacerbated by population growth, weak landholder incentives, and poor PA management

The project builds logically upon a number of government and donor initiatives and it is innovative through its use of conservation agreements with landholders.

Finally, STAP feels that the risks identified in the PIF are particularly honest and strong. This is a realistic and achievable GEF project, with a good match between proposed activities and budgets. The implementing agency accepts that the risk is substantial, especially related to the integration of political and governance components, improving PA organizational capacity, and the availability of technical solutions for improved livelihoods and sustainable production practices.

<i>response</i>	
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>